announced French translation in preparation under the direction of Marguerite Harl? That makes a lot of difference.

On p. 73 l. 18 the text makes sense only if for 'parent' 'MT' is read.

In addition to the Errata listed on a loose sheet corrections are to be put on p. 18 l. 22 (read: Esrabuches), p. 53 l. 4 (read: somewhere), p. 59 l. 2 (read: expanded), p. 103 l. 22 (read: metathesis), and p. 331 l. 20 (read: Schuurmans Stekhoven, J.Z., and put into the right alphabetical place). The MT of Gen. 4, 20 on p. 39 lacks a translation. The dissertation of A. van der Kooy mentioned on p. 280 has now appeared in an improved German version entitled: Die alten Textzeugen des Jesajabuches. Ein Beitrag zur Textgeschichte des Alten Testaments (Freiburg Schweiz-Göttingen 1981).

A. Hilhorst

Émile Turdeanu, Apocryphes slaves et roumains de l'Ancien Testament (Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha, ed. A. M. Denis, M. de Jonge, 5), E. J. Brill, Leiden, 1981, xii and 485 pp., cloth f 156,— (Over the past three decades Emile Turdeanu has endeavoured to shed light on one of the murkier areas of apocryphal tradition. This collection of twelve studies, starting with his 1950 essay on the Bogomils and including previously unpublished work on the Life of Adam and Eve and the Paralipomena of Jeremiah, provides a welcome opportunity to survey and reflect on his achievement.

T.'s approach is not, in most cases, interpretative. The questions he seeks to elucidate are textual, not theological, and only rarely historical. His sub-headings are the solemn formulae of his chosen discipline: the MSS; the translation in relation to its original; the time and place of translation (normally postulated on the basis of linguistic evidence); the variant versions. T. has ordered the raw material into neat, often elegant structures of textual dependence and interrelationship. He has provided a frame of reference for future editors.

Not that the task is completed. First steps are taken with caution, and must be assessed with caution. Reading through this collection, one becomes increasingly aware of certain limitations, some unavoidable, some self-imposed. I give examples from his studies of the Russian traditions.

First, T. bases his arguments mainly on printed texts, not MSS, though he labels the texts according to the MSS from which they are derived. To some extent this restriction is enforced: access to the MSS can be notoriously difficult. T. himself demonstrates the potential importance of unpublished MSS in his discussion of MS A of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (pp. 241-9). Clearly, without a fuller range of MSS many of the textual hypotheses must remain more tentative than one would like. Surprisingly, therefore, T. sometimes omits to consider material which is
readily available, whether in descriptions or in editions. On the *Apocalypse of Abraham* he does not discuss the important MS Tikh. 704 (long since discussed by Istrin, 1905-6, 1912). In his study on the *Paralipomena of Jeremiah* he unaccountably uses the 1899 partial edition of the *Uspeishn sbornik*, rather than the full and scholarly 1971 edition. In his additional notes (pp. 436 ff.), apparently intended to inform the reader of more recent developments in the field, he fails to take into account the work of Sumnikova, 1969, on the ‘historical’ Paleya: instead of T.’s four MSS of the Russian recension Sumnikova describes thirteen, four of which date from the fifteenth century; and her linguistic analysis leads her to conclusions rather different from those of T. The solid facade of T.’s hypotheses is somewhat undermined by such lapses.

Secondly, T. analyses only more or less complete texts. Rarely does he seek out fragments, though fragments can be vital to the reconstruction of textual history. The perils of this method are evident in his discussion of the *Apocalypse of Abraham*. The MSS of his ‘abridged’ Russian version relate the story of how Abraham set fire to his father’s idols, and of how his brother Haran perished in the flames while trying to save them: thus, adds a commentator, Haran was the first son to die before his father. According to T. (p. 185), the appended commentary was stimulated by the compilative text in the 1406-type Paleya, at a fairly late stage in the Russian tradition. This is incorrect: the same commentary is cited in the *Russian Primary Chronicle* (ed. Likhachev, p. 65), in a section which dates from no later than the start of the twelfth century. Furthermore, T. asserts that the commentary, though not the episode, occurs only in Russian. Again he is mistaken: see e.g. George the Monk (Hamartolos), *Chronicon*, ed. de Boor, p. 93; Epiphanius, *Panarion*, III, 6. This is a small example, but it illustrates the dangers of ignoring fragments and scattered quotations: the date of composition is out by at least a millenium; its place of origin is wrongly located; and the explanation for its appearance, so plausible on the basis of T.’s evidence alone, must be spurious.

Thirdly, T. does not always explore adequately the links between text and context. Several of these apocrypha are found mainly in the Russian Paleya interpretata, and their history is therefore tied to the textual history of the Paleya. T.’s treatment of this problem is too sketchy for comfort. As a rule he labels the MSS plain *Paleya interpretata*, without specifying the type or family. When he does indicate the existence of different versions, his statements are erroneous and misleading. He speaks of two versions (pp. 266-7), rather than the three which exist both in fact and in all the relevant descriptions (Shakhmatov, 1904; Iстомин, 1905-13; Istrin, 1905-6; Tvорогов, 1975 et al.). He omits to mention the Kratkaya (‘short’) khronograficheskaya Paleya—perhaps because it is unpublished—and instead he confusingly terms the Kolomna-type Paleya the ‘short’ version, though it is indeed shorter than the Polnaya (‘full’) khronograficheskaya Paleya. And